UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,185	03/29/2001	Ravi L. Sahita	10559/457001/P10868	9173

20985 7590 09/26/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
WANG, LIANG CHE A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/823,185	SAHITA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 35-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 35-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18, 35-47 are presented for examination.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 18, 35, 37, 40 are amended and claim 44-46 are newly added.

Response to Argument

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

   a. There is no motivation to incorporate a method of translating communication protocols of ADC devices into champlin.

      This is not persuasive because a motivation is provided to allow Champlin's system to communicate with devices operated under different protocols as taught by Ramberg (figure 2 and related section, Col 7 lines 47-62.)

   a. That: Champlin doesn't teach the amended claim limitation "a first database having metadata that is received from a remote source".

      This is found not persuasive because Champlin teaches a first database (item 70 is viewed as a first database, Figure 4) having metadata (Translation of data is a description of the original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata descriptive of data stored in MIB 72) that is received from a remote source (Col 5 lines 21-23, metadata stored in table 70 are collected from various translation tables from different sub-agents 66 (remote source)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champlin et al., US Patent Number 6,519,635, hereinafter Champlin, in views of Ramberg et al., US Patent Number 6,857,013, hereinafter Ramberg.

7. Referring to claim 1, Champlin teaches a managed node comprising:

   a. a first database (item 70 is viewed as a first database, Figure 4) having metadata (Translation of data is a description of the original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata descriptive of data stored in MIB 72) that is received from a remote source (Col 5 lines 21-23, metadata stored in table 70 are collected from various translation tables from different sub-agents 66 (remote source)) and that is descriptive of data stored in a second database (MIB 72 is viewed as a second database)(Col 5 lines 21-23, various translation are stored in table 70 to map MIB object from MIB 72, Col 5 lines 15-18. Translation of data is a description of the original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata descriptive of data stored in MIB 72);

b. a first process in communication with said second database (Figure 4, SNMP agent 64 must be in communication with MIB 72 in order to make MIB 72 to be functional (Col 5 lines 11-57);

c. a second process in communication with said first process through a first protocol (Col 5 lines 45-48), said second process receiving communication transmitted across a network using a second format and having access to said metadata in said first database for translation between said first and second formats (Col 5 lines 11-59, translation of protocols are provided between SNMP Manager 62 and SNMP Master Agent 64 and Sub Agent 66 to communicate over network 60.)

Champlin does not teach the use of second protocols and translation between said first and second protocols

However, Ramberg teaches the use of second protocols (communication protocol of ADC devices) and translation between first (SNMP protocol) and second protocols (Col 7 lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of translating between the communications protocol of ADC devices and the standardized SNMP protocol using information from MIB of Ramberg in Champlin such that to have translation between said first and second protocols in Champlin, because both Champlin and Ramberg teach inventions relates to translating information in a SNMP environment using MIB (see figure 4 of Champlin and figure 2 of Ramberg.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because having the MIB of Champlin containing information for translation between protocols would allow Champlin's system to communicate with devices operated under different protocols as taught by Ramberg (figure 2 and related section, Col 7 lines 47-62.)

8. Referring to claim 2, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said first process comprises an SNMP agent (Figure 4 item 64 is a SNMP agent.)
9. Referring to claim 3, Champlin teaches a managed node comprising:
    a. a first database (item 70 is viewed as a first database, Figure 4) having metadata descriptive of data stored in a second database (MIB 72 is viewed as a second database)(Col 5 lines 21-23, various translation are stored in table 70 to map MIB object from MIB 72, Col 5 lines 15-18. Translation of data is a description of the original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata descriptive of data stored in MIB 72);
    b. a first process in communication with said second database (Figure 4, SNMP agent 64 must be in communication with MIB 72 in order to make MIB 72 to be functional (Col 5 lines 11-57);
    c. a second process in communication with said first process through a first protocol (Col 5 lines 45-48), said second process receiving communication transmitted across a network using a second format and having access to said metadata in said first database for translation between said first and second formats (Col 5 lines

11-59, translation of protocols are provided between SNMP Manager 62 and SNMP Master Agent 64 and Sub Agent 66 to communicate over network 60); and

d. wherein said second process comprises a network shim layer providing an interface between said first process and said network (the system translates the protocol format from one format into the second format of appropriate SNMP agent 66, which serves the same function as the network shim layer is providing. Col 5 lines 41-51.)

Champlin does not teach the use of second protocols and translation between said first and second protocols

However, Ramberg teaches the use of second protocols (communication protocol of ADC devices) and translation between first (SNMP protocol) and second protocols (Col 7 lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of translating between the communications protocol of ADC devices and the standardized SNMP protocol using information from MIB of Ramberg in Champlin such that to have translation between said first and second protocols in Champlin, because both Champlin and Ramberg teach inventions relates to translating information in a SNMP environment using MIB (see figure 4 of Champlin and figure 2 of Ramberg.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because having the MIB of Champlin containing information for translation between protocols would allow Champlin's system to communicate with

devices outside of SNMP environment as taught by Ramberg (figure 2 and related section)

10. Referring to claim 5, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said second database comprises a MIB (item 72, figure 4).
11. Referring to claim 6, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said first protocol comprises an application program interface for said SNMP agent (Col 2 lines 24-26).
12. Referring to claim 8, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 3, wherein said metadata is obtained from a remote source (Col 5 lines 28-30.)
13. Referring to claim 9, claim 9 encompasses the similar scope of the invention as that of the claim 1, and Champlin further teaches a managed network (see figure 4), comprising: a management station (item 62), and a managed node (item 64) in communication with said management station using a selected protocol (Figure 4 shows SNMP Manager is communicating with SNMP Master Agent.) Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as claimed 1 and the further teaching limitation from Champlin.
14. Referring to claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 2-3, 5-6, 8. Therefore, claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 2-3, 5-6, 8.
15. Claims 4, 7, 10, 14 and 17, 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champlin in views of Ramberg and in further views of Pan et al., US Patent Number 6,775,701, hereinafter Pan.

16. Referring to claim 4, Champlin as modified teaches an invention as described in claims 1. Champlin as modified does not explicitly taught the protocol comprises COPS-PR protocol.

However, Pan teaches the use the COPS-PR protocol in network communication among network devices (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate COPS-PR of Pan in Champlin such that to have the COPS-PR protocol as the protocol for the network communication in Champlin's system, because Champlin is having a network management system where nodes are communicating via a network (figure 4), and Pan is teaching COPS-PR could be the protocol for communication in a network system (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because COPS-PR is one of the well-known protocols along with SNMP, COPS-RSVP, and CLI as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 55-58), having COPS would allow a query response protocol used to exchange policy data between a server and a set of client, as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 59-61), to be implemented on Champlin's system.

17. Referring to claim 7, Champlin as modified teaches the invention as described in claim 5. Champlin has not explicitly taught the protocol comprises a COPS protocol.

However, Pan teaches the use the COPS protocol in network communication among network devices (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate COPS of Pan in Champlin such that to have the COPS protocol as the protocol for the network communication in Champlin's system, because Champlin is having a network management system where nodes are communicating via a network (figure 4), and Pan is teaching COPS could be the protocol for communication in a network system (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because COPS is one of the well-known protocols along with SNMP, COPS-RSVP, and CLI as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 55-58), having COPS would allow a query response protocol used to exchange policy data between a server and a set of client, as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 59-61), to be implemented on Champlin's system.

18. Referring to claims 10, 14, 17, claims 10, 14, and 17 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 4 and 7. Therefore, claims 10, 14, and 17 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 4 and 7.

19. Referring to claim 35-40, claims 35-40 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-6. Therefore, claims 35-40 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-6.

20. Referring to claim 41-42, claims 41-42 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 41-42 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-4.

21. Referring to claim 43, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 41, wherein the metadata is obtained from a remote source. (Champlin, Col 5 lines 21-23.)

22. Referring to claim 44, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 13, wherein the network shim layer is adapted to determine when to send a report to the management station (Col 5 lines 55-59, after translated, a PDU is transmitted to the SNMP Manager 62).

23. Referring to claim 45, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 13, wherein the network shim layer is adapted to use the metadata in the first database to identify an object in the second database that is to be accessed (Col 5 lines 21-23, various translation are stored in table 70 to map MIB object from MIB 72, Col 5 lines 15-18. Translation of data is a description of the original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata descriptive of data stored in MIB 72).

24. Referring to claim 46, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 13, wherein the network shim layer is adapted to receive a first message from the first process (Col 5 lines 55-59).

25. Referring to claim 47, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 46, wherein the network shim layer is further adapted to access the metadata in the first database to formulate a second message to the management station (SNMP manager 62) based on the first message (Col 5 lines 54-59, SNMP agent 64 uses translation table 70 to translate message in a data record format to an SNMP PDU object identifier format, and after translated, the PDU is transmitted to the SNMP Manager 62).

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

27. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

29. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

30. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang
September 19, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER